

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 were pending. Claims 24-26 have been added and claims 1-3, 9-11, and 17-19 have been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 1-26 remain pending subsequent entry of the present amendment.

In the present Office Action, claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,539,455 (hereinafter “Khanna”). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections and requests reconsideration.

Generally speaking, the presently claimed invention and the cited art are quite different. As noted above, each of the independent claims have been amended to clarify their nature. The claimed invention is generally directed to a method and mechanism for rapidly identifying particular needed sub-blocks of a transfer request. To that end, a transfer request corresponding to a given block is received, and a plurality of different addresses for each of the sub-blocks within the block are generated in response to receiving the transfer request. Those sub-blocks which are required for the transfer are then detected and only those addresses (for the required sub-blocks) are then utilized.

In contrast, Khanna is generally directed to a mechanism for identifying a best match within a content addressable memory in which the contents are not presorted. With respect to claim 1 as amended, a method is recited which includes “receiving a transfer request which corresponds to a block of data, wherein said block comprises a plurality of sub-blocks, said transfer request comprising an address and a mask which indicates which of said sub-blocks are required as part of the request.” In the present Office Action, a compare instruction (Khanna, col. 22, lines 37-43) is cited as being equivalent to a transfer request. In addition, the prefix mask data of Khanna is cited as being equivalent to the mask (see Office Action discussion concerning claim 2). However, as amended, claim 1 recites that the transfer request includes an address and mask. In contrast, Khanna does not disclose a transfer request which includes an address and mask. For example, the prefix mask data of Khanna is stored as part of a CAM entry. It is

believed the clarifying amendment to claim 1 readily distinguishes it from the cited art and further reveals their quite distinct natures. As each of claims 9 and 17 include similar features, each of these claims are believed patentable for similar reasons.

In addition to the above, support for claims 24-26 may be found in at least FIG. 6 and the accompanying description. Applicant submits the features recited in claims 24-26 are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art.

Applicant believes the application to be in condition for allowance. However, should the examiner believe issues remain which would prevent its allowance, the below signed representative requests a telephone interview at (512) 853-8866 to facilitate a more speedy resolution.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-95300/RDR.

Respectfully submitted,



Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: November 15, 2005